

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated May 12, 2008. Claims 1-36 and 38-46 are currently pending. Claims 1, 25, and 35 have been amended. New matter has not been added with the amendments to the claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-8, 10, 12-15, 18-28, and 32-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,136,849 to Patrick (“Patrick”), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0189693 to Kenig (“Kenig”), and U.S. Patent No. 5,977,969 to DiAngelo (“DiAngelo”). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited references.

Claim 1 recites “identifying a portion of the URL that corresponds to a hostname component of the URL; identifying at least one other portion of the URL that corresponds to the other components of the URL” and “visually distinguishing the identified hostname component of the URL from the identified other components of the URL.” Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach at least these features of the claim.

As indicated in the Office Action, the Patrick and Kenig references fail to teach visually distinguishing an identified hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL (Office Action, page 3). In addition, the Patrick and Kenig reference fail to teach identifying at least one other portion of the URL that corresponds to the other components of the URL nor does the Office Action include a citation to any portion of the reference that is asserted to teach such a limitation.

The DiAngelo reference also fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Patrick and the Kenig references. The DiAngelo reference teaches visually distinguishing text entered as blocks of text from text entered by single characters from a physical or virtual keyboard (DiAngelo, Abstract). Thus, rather than teaching identifying portions of a URL that correspond to a hostname

component and that correspond to other components and visually distinguishing between identified hostname component and other identified components, the DiAngelo reference teaches visually distinguishing text based on how the text is entered into the URL to be obtained. Accordingly, claim 1 and its corresponding claims are allowable over the cited art.

Independent claims 25 and 35 recite limitations similar, but not identical, to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 1, claims 25 and 35 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 9, 11, and 31 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick, Kenig, DiAngelo, and U.S. Patent No. 5,961,591 to Jones et al. ("Jones"). Claims 9 and 11 are dependent on claim 1 and claim 31 is dependent on claim 25. For at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with claims 1 and 25, the Patrick, the Kenig, and the DiAngelo references fail to teach all the features of claims 1 and 25. The Jones reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Patrick, the Kenig, and the DiAngelo references. Thus, claims 1 and 25 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 16-17 and 29-30 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick, Kenig, DiAngelo, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0169685 to Kubala ("Kubala"). Claims 16-17 are dependent on claim 1 and claims 29-30 are dependent on claim 25. For at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with claims 1 and 25, the Patrick, Kenig, and DiAngelo references fail to teach all the features of claims 1 and 25. The Kubala reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Patrick, the Kenig, and the DiAngelo references. Thus, claims 1 and 25 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 36, 38, 40, and 43-46 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick, Jones, and U.S. Patent No. 7,058,978 to Feuerstein (“Feuerstein”). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the cited art.

Amended claim 36 recites “accessing a URL corresponding to a link presented for selection to a user, the URL including a hostname component and other components”, “identifying at least one other portion of the URL that corresponds to other components of the URL” and “determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an analysis of the hostname component and the other components.” As indicated in the Office Action, the Patrick reference and the Jones reference do not teach identifying at least one other portion of a URL that corresponds to other components of a URL and determining whether a URL is suspicious based on an analysis of an hostname component and other components (Office Action, page 10).

The Feuerstein reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Patrick and the Jones references. The Office Action states that the Feuerstein reference teaches these features at column 6, lines 6-45, FIG. 6, and column 9, lines 33-39. However, the cited portions of the Feuerstein reference teach how to process and evaluate resource requests. The Feuerstein reference teaches evaluating each file extension request of a resource identifier contained within a resource request and allowing file extension lengths of up to four characters (Feuerstein, column 6, lines 34-37). The Feuerstein reference also teaches that a request validation component verifies that a file extension in a resource is valid by comparing the file extension with a list of valid file extensions (Feuerstein, column 6, lines 40-44). Determining if a file extension is valid by comparing it to a list of valid file extensions is not the same as determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an analysis of the hostname component and the other components. Accordingly, claim 36 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 39, 41, and 42 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick, Jones, Feuerstein, and Kenig. Claims 39, 41, and 42 depend on independent claim 36. For at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with claim 36, the Patrick, Jones, and

Feuerstein references fail to teach all the features of the claim. The Kenig reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Patrick, Jones, and Feuerstein references. Accordingly, claim 36 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claim 42 was rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick, Jones, Fueurstein, Kenig, and DiAngelo. Claim 42 depends on independent claim 36. For at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with claim 36, the Patrick, Jones, Feuerstein, and Kenig references fail to teach all the features of the claim. The DiAngelo reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Patrick, Jones, and Feuerstein references. Accordingly, claim 36 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Applicant : Conor P. Cahill
Serial No. : 10/675,781
Filed : September 30, 2003
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-
446001 / Communications 99

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 12, 2008

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/
Elizabeth Philip Dahm
Reg. No. 51,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street, Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6119
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945